REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

> **Claims 1-3, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rangaraian et al. US Patent No. 5,828,830. Rangaraian teaches the invention as claimed including a method and system for prioritizing and filtering traps from network devices (see abstract)As per claim 1, Rangaraian teaches a method comprising processing information about network faults that contribute to a failure of a network element in which the faults are occurring (a system is monitored and faults on the system are noted by an agent; column 2, lines 6-29; column 3, lines 58-67; column 4, lines 1-4), and sending traps to a network management station with respect to fewer than all of the faults that are occurring, based on the results of the information processing (the agent sends traps to the network manager; column 2, lines 6-29, column 3, lines 57-67, column 4, lines 1-5; column 4, lines 20-67; column 5, lines 1-13).**

The applicant disagrees. In Rangaraian, so long as certain conditions occur at a device to signify a fault, an agent generates a trap and sends the trap to notify a network manager of the fault. (see col. 2, lines 8-10; col. 3, lines 47-49). As a large number of traps may be received by the network manager, the Rangaraian system implements techniques *at the network manager* to reduce the number of traps that are subsequently brought to a network administrator's attention:

> When an agent sends out a trap on the network 10, the network manager 40, receives, filters and prioritizes the trap, and then notifies a network administrator of the trap. Filtering and prioritization can be performed on specific types of traps, traps from specific devices and traps from specific enterprises. **Filtering is performed to reduce the number of traps that have to be processed, and prioritization is performed to indicate the relative importance of the traps to the network administrator.** The network manager 40 provides the network administrator with great flexibility in identifying important problems on the network 10 and responding to the situation at hand. Such flexibility allows the network administrator to manage large numbers of traps in an easy, efficient and intelligent manner. (col. 3, line 58 – col. 4, line 4).

By contrast, the method of claim 1 includes "processing information about network faults..., *based on the results of the information processing, generating traps with respect to fewer than all of the faults that are occurring*, and sending the traps to a network management station."

As per claim 7, Rangaraian teaches a method comprising at a network management station, receiving traps sent from network elements, the traps including information about at least some faults occurring in entities of the network elements, the traps not including information about at least some faults occurring in the entities, reporting the traps to an operator of the network management station (a system is monitored and faults on the system are noted by an agent and the agent sends traps to the network manager; column 2, lines 6-29; column 3, lines 58-67; column 4; column 5, lines 1-13).

Claim 7 has been amended to recite that the traps received at a network management station from network elements include information "about *root cause* faults occurring in entities of the network elements, the traps not including information about at least some *cascading* faults, triggered by the root cause faults, ..." The examiner concedes, with respect to claim 9 (see below), that Rangaraian does not teach faults having a causal relationship and cites Rariden only as describing a causal relationship "of relative sequential position of a trap in a series of traps."

Rariden does not describe and would not have made obvious a relationship in which some cascading faults are triggered by root cause faults, as recited in amended claim 7.

Claims 4-6, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangaraian et al. US Patent No. 5,828,830 in view of Rariden et al. US Patent No. 6,292,472. Rarident teaches the invention as claimed including checking faults in a network (see abstract).

...

12. As per claim 10, Rangaraian teaches Apparatus comprising a network element having network entities that are subject to faults, the faults of at least some others of the network entities having relationships to the faults of at least some of the network entities (a system is monitored and faults on the system are noted by an agent and the agent sends traps to the network manager; column 2, lines 6-29; column 3, lines 58-67; column 4; column 5, lines 1-13). a medium bearing information capable of configuring a machine in the network element to send traps (the agent sends traps to the network manager; column 2, lines 6-29, column 3, lines 58-67, column 4; column 5, lines 1-13).Rangaraian does not teach based on the causal relationships to a network management station. Rariden teaches that faults have a causal relationship (column 3, lines 9-35).
It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine determining faults of Rangaraian with determining the causal relationship of faults of Rariden. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to determine the priority of the faults so that the most important faults are handled in a more urgent manner (Rangaraian column 3, lines 58-67; column 4, lines 1-4).

Claim 10 has been amended to recite that the faults of at least some of the network entities "cause or are caused by faults of at least some others of the network entities..." Amended claim 10 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 7.

As per claim 11, Rangaraian teaches a medium bearing information capable of configuring a machine to determine faults occurring in entities of a network element (a system is monitored and faults on the system are noted by an agent and the agent sends traps to the

network manager; column 2, lines 6-29; column 3, lines 58-67; column 4; column 5, lines 1-13) Rangaraian does not teach determining causal relationships to a network management station. Rariden teaches determining the causal relationship between (column 3, lines 9-35). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine determining faults of Rangaraian with determining the causal relationship of faults of Ridden. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to determine the priority of the faults so that the most important faults are handled in a more urgent manner (Rangaraian column 3, lines 58-67; column 4, lines 1-4).

Amended claim 11 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 7.

The applicant notes that claim 13 has not been rejected.

All dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/8/06

Mandy Jubang
Reg. No. 45,884

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906
21264176.doc